



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/991,150	11/16/2001	Avi J. Ashkenazi	P2730P1C48	4272
28442	7590	10/07/2003	EXAMINER	
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE			KEMMERER, ELIZABETH	
P.O. BOX 10395			ART UNIT	
CHICAGO, IL 60610			PAPER NUMBER	

1646

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/991,150

Applicant(s)

ASHKENAZI ET AL.

Examiner

Elizabeth C. Kemmerer, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1646

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 September 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 119-138 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 119-138 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☒ Other: Notice to Comply

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Application, Amendments, And/Or Claims

The amendments filed 16 November 2001 (Paper No. 4) and 03 September 2002 (Paper No. 5) have been entered in full. Claims 1-118 are canceled. Claims 119-138 are under examination.

Sequence Rules

This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). However, this application fails to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.821 through 1.825 for the reasons(s) set forth on the attached Notice To Comply With Requirements For Patent Applications Containing Nucleotide Sequence And/Or Amino Acid Sequence Disclosures. Examination was performed on the instant claims using the sequence listing filed in copending application 09/941992.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Also, pp. 303-306 of the specification are missing.

Art Unit: 1646

35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112, First Paragraph

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 119-138 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a credible, specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility.

The claims are directed to isolated nucleic acids encoding polypeptides having at least 80% identity to a SEQ ID NO: 20 with or without its signal peptide, or to the extracellular domain of SEQ ID NO: 20 with or without its signal peptide. Dependent claims are directed to vectors and host cells comprising the isolated nucleic acids. The specification contains numerous asserted utilities for the claimed nucleic acids, including use as hybridization probes, in chromosome and gene mapping, in the generation of anti-sense RNA and DNA, to make "knock-out" mice or other animals, and in gene therapy. None of these asserted utilities are specific to the claimed nucleic acids, since such can be applied to any nucleic acid. Also, these asserted utilities are not substantial, since further research would be required to determine the significance of each asserted utility. For example, one skilled in the art would not know why a hybridization probe is useful unless the significance of the gene from which it was

derived was known, or a correlation has been established between a disease or developmental state and an altered level of transcript of the gene from which the probe is derived. Such has not been disclosed, and would require significant further research by the skilled artisan to determine such. Chromosome and gene mapping are generally well-known techniques, but nothing has been disclosed about the significance of the instantly claimed sequence's chromosomal location, such as proximity to genetic disease marker sites. The determination of such involves further research, and thus this asserted utility is also not substantial. Anti-sense RNA and DNA are only useful if something is known about the physiological effects of expression of the gene from which the anti-sense constructs are derived. Such has not been disclosed in the instant specification. The skilled artisan would have to resort to significant further research in order to determine these physiological effects. "Knock-out" animals are only useful if they display a useful phenotype. The instant specification does not disclose a phenotype, and thus significant further research would be required to determine the usefulness of these animals. Gene therapy is useless until a correlation has been established between a specific disease state and an altered level or form of the gene in question. Such a correlation has not been established by the instant disclosure, and significant further research would be required to establish such. Therefore, none of these asserted utilities is substantial.

The specification also asserts that the claimed nucleic acids have utility by virtue of the fact that they encode the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 20 (PRO341). This would only be a credible, specific and substantial utility if the polypeptide had a credible,

Art Unit: 1646

specific and substantial utility. Such is not the case for the following reasons. The specification teaches that PRO341 is a membrane-bound polypeptide with several transmembrane domains. The specification does not disclose that PRO341 has significant structural similarity to any fully characterized polypeptides. There is no biological activity, expression pattern, phenotype, disease or condition, ligand, binding partner, or any other specific feature that is disclosed as being associated with PRO341. Without any information as to the specific properties of PRO341, the mere identification of such as being a membrane-bound polypeptide possessing several transmembrane domains is not sufficient to impart any particular utility to the claimed polypeptides.

At pages 539-555, it is disclosed that nucleic acids encoding PRO341 had a ΔCt value of at least 1.0 for a number of primary lung tumors, but not for all tested colon or lung tumor cell lines. At page 548, ΔCt is defined as the threshold PCR cycle, or the cycle at which the reporter signal accumulates above the background level of fluorescence. The specification further indicates that ΔCt is used as "a quantitative measurement of the relative number of starting copies of a particular target sequence in a nucleic acid sample when comparing cancer DNA results to normal human DNA results." The Examiner is unable to find, either in the specification or in the art, an explanation of how ΔCt values are calculated, nor what the significance of such are. It is noted that at page 548, it is stated that samples are used if their values are within 1 Ct of the 'normal standard'. It is further noted that the ΔCt values at pages 550-554 are expressed (a) with values to one one-hundredth of a unit (e.g. 2.58), and (b) that very

Art Unit: 1646

few values were obtained that were at least 2. It is not clear how measurements of hundredths of a PCR cycle can be made, nor what the significance of a difference of 1 or 2 PCR cycles would be. Given the paucity of information, the data do not support the implicit conclusion of the specification that PRO341 shows a positive correlation with lung cancer, much less that the levels of PRO341 would be diagnostic of such. Even *if* the data demonstrated a slight increase in copy number of PRO341 nucleic acids in primary tumors, such would not be indicative of a use of the encoded polypeptide as a diagnostic agent. Cancerous tissue is known to be aneuploid, that is, having an abnormal number of chromosomes (see Sen, 2000, Curr. Opin. Oncol. 12:82-88). The data presented in the specification were not corrected for aneuploidy. A slight amplification of a gene does not necessarily mean overexpression in a cancer tissue, but can merely be an indication that the cancer tissue is aneuploid. The preliminary data were not supported by analysis of mRNA or protein expression, for example. Also, the literature reports that it does not necessarily follow that an increase in gene copy number results in increased gene expression and increased polypeptide expression, such that the claimed nucleic acids or the encoded polypeptides would be useful for diagnosis of cancer or as a drug target. For example, Pennica et al. (1998, PNAS USA 95:14717-14722) disclose that:

“An analysis of *WISP-1* gene amplification and expression in human colon tumors showed a correlation between DNA amplification and overexpression, whereas overexpression of *WISP-3* RNA was seen in the absence of DNA amplification. In contrast, *WISP-2* DNA was amplified in the colon tumors, but its mRNA expression was significantly reduced in the majority of tumors compared with the expression in normal colonic mucosa from the same patient.”

See p. 14722, second paragraph of left column; pp. 14720-14721, "Amplification and Aberrant Expression of *WISPs* in Human Colon Tumors." Thus, the data do not support the implicit assertion that PRO341 can be used as a cancer diagnostic. Significant further research would have been required of the skilled artisan to determine whether PRO341 is overexpressed in any cancer to the extent that it could be used as a cancer diagnostic, and thus the implicitly asserted utility is not substantial.

Claims 119-138 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a credible, specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

Furthermore, the specification does not enable the claimed variants of nucleic acids encoding SEQ ID NO: 20. The problem of predicting protein structure from sequence data and in turn utilizing predicted structural determinations to ascertain functional aspects of the protein is extremely complex. While it is known that many amino acid substitutions are generally possible in any given protein the positions within the protein's sequence where such amino acid substitutions can be made with a reasonable expectation of success are limited. Certain positions in the sequence are critical to the protein's structure/function relationship, e.g. such as various sites or regions directly involved in binding, activity and in providing the correct three-dimensional spatial orientation of binding and active sites. These or other regions may also be critical determinants of antigenicity. These regions can tolerate only relatively

Art Unit: 1646

conservative substitutions or no substitutions (see Wells, 1990, Biochemistry 29:8509-8517; Ngo et al., 1994, The Protein Folding Problem and Tertiary Structure Prediction, pp. 492-495). However, Applicant has provided little or no guidance beyond the mere presentation of sequence data to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to determine, without undue experimentation, the positions in the protein which are tolerant to change (e.g. such as by amino acid substitutions or deletions), and the nature and extent of changes that can be made in these positions. Although the specification outlines art-recognized procedures for producing and screening for active muteins, this is not adequate guidance as to the nature of active derivatives that may be constructed, but is merely an invitation to the artisan to use the current invention as a starting point for further experimentation. Even if an active or binding site were identified in the specification, they may not be sufficient, as the ordinary artisan would immediately recognize that an active or binding site must assume the proper three-dimensional configuration to be active, which conformation is dependent upon surrounding residues; therefore substitution of non-essential residues can often destroy activity. The art recognizes that function cannot be predicted from structure alone (Bork, 2000, Genome Research 10:398-400; Skolnick et al., 2000, Trends in Biotech. 18(1):34-39, especially p. 36 at Box 2; Doerks et al., 1998, Trends in Genetics 14:248-250; Smith et al., 1997, Nature Biotechnology 15:1222-1223; Brenner, 1999, Trends in Genetics 15:132-133; Bork et al., 1996, Trends in Genetics 12:425-427). Due to the large quantity of experimentation necessary to generate the infinite number of derivatives recited in the claims and possibly screen same for activity, the lack of direction/guidance presented in

Art Unit: 1646

the specification regarding which structural features are required in order to provide activity, the absence of working examples directed to same, the complex nature of the invention, the state of the prior art which establishes the unpredictability of the effects of mutation on protein structure and function, and the breadth of the claims which fail to recite any structural or functional limitations, undue experimentation would be required of the skilled artisan to make and/or use the claimed invention in its full scope.

Finally, claims 119-124 and 131-138 encompass nucleic acids that encode polypeptides that are structurally defined by reference to a biological deposit, ATCC accession number 209792. Since the deposited molecules are essential to the claimed invention they must be obtainable by a repeatable method set forth in the specification or otherwise readily available to the public. If the deposited molecules are not so obtainable or available, the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 may be satisfied by a deposit of the nucleic acid molecules. The specification does not disclose a repeatable process to obtain the deposited molecules and it is not apparent if the deposited molecules are readily available to the public. It is noted that Applicant has made a deposit (pp 563-565 of the specification), but there is no indication in the specification as to public availability. If the deposit is made under the Budapest Treaty, then an affidavit or declaration by Applicant, or a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature and registration number, stating that the specific nucleic acid molecules have been deposited under the Budapest Treaty and that the nucleic acid molecules will be irrevocably and without restriction or condition released to the public upon the issuance of a patent, would satisfy the deposit requirement made herein. If the deposit

has not been made under the Budapest Treaty, then in order to certify that the deposit meets the criteria set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.801-1.809, Applicant may provide assurance of compliance by an affidavit or declaration, or by a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature and registration number, showing that:

- (a) during the pendency of this application, access to the invention will be afforded to the Commissioner upon request;
- (b) all restrictions upon availability to the public will be irrevocably removed upon granting of the patent;
- (c) the deposit will be maintained in a public depository for a period of 30 years or 5 years after the last request or for the effective life of the patent, whichever is longer;
- (d) a test of the viability of the biological material at the time of deposit will be made (see 37 C.F.R. § 1.807); and
- (e) the deposit will be replaced if it should ever become inviable.

Claims 119-123 and 132-138 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claims are drawn to nucleic acids encoding polypeptides having at least 80%, 85%, 90%, 95% or 99% sequence identity with a particular disclosed sequence. Also, claims are directed to nucleic acids that hybridize to nucleic acids encoding a particular sequence. The claims do not require that the encoded polypeptide possess any particular biological activity, nor any particular conserved structure, or other disclosed distinguishing feature. Thus, the claims are drawn to a genus of nucleic acids encoding polypeptides that are defined only by sequence identity. Further, the claims require the 'extracellular domain' of the protein, for which there is no description in the specification.

To provide evidence of possession of a claimed genus, the specification must provide sufficient distinguishing identifying characteristics of the genus. The factors to be considered include disclosure of complete or partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics, structure/function correlation, methods of making the claimed product, or any combination thereof. In this case, the only factor present in the claim is a partial structure in the form of a recitation of percent identity. There is not even identification of any particular portion of the structure that must be conserved. Accordingly, in the absence of sufficient recitation of distinguishing identifying characteristics, the specification does not provide adequate written description of the claimed genus.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, clearly states that “applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of *the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the ‘written description’ inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*.” (See page 1117.) The specification does not “clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed.” (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116). As discussed above, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed genus of polypeptides, and therefore conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The

Art Unit: 1646

compound itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016.

One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See *Fiddes v. Baird*, 30 USPQ2d 1481 at 1483. In *Fiddes*, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found to be unpatentable due to lack of written description for that broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

Therefore, only isolated nucleic acids encoding polypeptides comprising the amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO: 20, with or without the signal sequence, but not the full breadth of the claims meet the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 1115).

35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 119-124, 127, 128 and 132-138 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The protein identified as PRO341 is disclosed as having several transmembrane domains. The claims recite "the extracellular domain". However, if there are several

Art Unit: 1646

transmembrane domains, then there must be several extracellular domains. It is unclear which extracellular domain is intended. Further, the recitation of "the extracellular domain"..."lacking its associated signal sequence" (claim 119, part (d), for example) is indefinite as a signal sequence is not generally considered to be part of an extracellular domain, as signal sequences are cleaved from said domains in the process of secretion from the cell.

Also, claim 133 recites hybridization under stringent conditions. Neither the specification nor the art provides an unambiguous definition for this term. The term "stringent" in claim 133 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "stringent" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

35 U.S.C. § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 132-134 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Conklin et al. (U.S. Patent 6046028, issued 4/4/00, effective filing date 10/15/96).

Art Unit: 1646

Conklin et al. disclose SEQ ID NO : 1. Nucleotides 17-41 of Conklin et al.'s SEQ ID NO : 1 are 100% identical to nucleotides 12-36 of instantly recited SEQ ID NO: 19. Thus Conklin et al. teach an isolated nucleic acid which is at least 10 nucleotides in length that would reasonably be expected to hybridize under very low stringency conditions to instant SEQ ID NO: 19, since any DNA will hybridize to another under conditions of very low stringency. Very low stringency is a form of stringency. thus meeting the limitations of claims 133.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth C. Kemmerer, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (703) 308-2673. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Thursdays from 6:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler, Ph.D., can be reached on (703) 308-6564.

Official papers filed by fax should be directed to (703) 308-4242. Faxed draft or informal communications with the examiner should be directed to (703) 308-0294.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.



ELIZABETH KEMMERER
PRIMARY EXAMINER

**NOTICE TO COMPLY WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR PATENT APPLICATIONS CONTAINING
NUCLEOTIDE SEQUENCE AND/OR AMINO ACID SEQUENCE DISCLOSURES**

The nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosure contained in this application does not comply with the requirements for such a disclosure as set forth in 37 C.F.R. 1.821 - 1.825 for the following reason(s):

- ☒ 1. This application clearly fails to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.821-1.825. Applicant's attention is directed to these regulations, published at 1114 OG 29, May 15, 1990 and at 55 FR 18230, May 1, 1990.
- ☒ 2. This application does not contain, as a separate part of the disclosure on paper copy, a "Sequence Listing" as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(c).
- ☒ 3. A copy of the "Sequence Listing" in computer readable form has not been submitted as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e).
- ☐ 4. A copy of the "Sequence Listing" in computer readable form has been submitted. However, the content of the computer readable form does not comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.822 and/or 1.823, as indicated on the attached copy of the marked -up "Raw Sequence Listing."
- ☐ 5. The computer readable form that has been filed with this application has been found to be damaged and/or unreadable as indicated on the attached CRF Diskette Problem Report. A Substitute computer readable form must be submitted as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.825(d).
- ☐ 6. The paper copy of the "Sequence Listing" is not the same as the computer readable form of the "Sequence Listing" as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e).
- ☐ 7. Other:

Applicant Must Provide:

- ☒ An initial or substitute computer readable form (CRF) copy of the "Sequence Listing". Alternatively, Applicant may request transfer of the CRF listing from the parent application if it is the same as that in the instant application. Please see attached Sample Request.
- ☒ An initial or substitute paper copy of the "Sequence Listing", as well as an amendment directing its entry into the specification. Applicant must provide this even if they choose to request transfer of the CRF.
- ☒ A statement that the content of the paper and computer readable copies are the same and, where applicable, include no new matter, as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e) or 1.821(f) or 1.821(g) or 1.825(b) or 1.825(d).

For questions regarding compliance to these requirements, please contact:

For Rules Interpretation, call (703) 308-4216

For CRF Submission Help, call (703) 308-4212

For PatentIn software help, call (703) 308-6856

PLEASE RETURN A COPY OF THIS NOTICE WITH YOUR RESPONSE